



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,786	03/15/2004	José Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.321-US-01	9206
55895 7590 07/05/2007 GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			EXAMINER ORR, HENRY W	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/05/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,786

Applicant(s)

GARCIA ET AL.

Examiner

Henry Orr

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/15/2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 4/26/2007.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending in the case.
3. Claims 1, 6 and 11 are independent claims.

Terminal Disclaimer

4. The terminal disclaimer filed on 4/26/2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on Application Serial Nos. 10/800,585 and 10/800,877 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Applicant's Response

5. In Applicant's response dated 4/26/2007, applicant has amended the following:
 - a) Specification
 - b) Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 15

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 1/9/2007 are withdrawn:

- a) Objection to Specification
- b) 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection to claims 11-15.
- c) 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd Rejection to claims 1-15.
- d) Double Patenting Rejection to claims 1-15.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1-15 objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1, 6 and 11:

Claims 1, 6 and 11 are objected for reciting “**collection of zero**”, because a “collection” of Sheets cannot have zero sheets.

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15:

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 are objected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

7. Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. (hereinafter "Bonney"), U.S. Patent No. 6,339,439 B1, in view of Workman et al. (hereinafter "Workman"), U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0236754.**

Claim 1:

Bonny teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 1; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages a one or more Sheet Sets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of zero or more Sheets and Subsets of the Sheets, each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view)** Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing a Sheet Set.

However, Workman teaches an interface for publishing a Sheet set (see par. 5, par. 51). **(claim 1; i.e., and the Sheet Set Manager publishes the Sheet Set.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly reviewing drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 51).

Claim 2:

Bonney fails to expressly teach publishing a selection of Sheets within the Sheet Set using a single operation.

However, Workman teaches a single operation of a click that is used to publish target drawings (see par. 51). **(claim 2; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager publishes a selection of the Sheets within the Sheet Set using a single operation.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface capable of receiving a single click operation as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly reviewing drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 51).

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 5:

Bonney teaches a plot stamp with each Sheet (see par 22).

Bonney fails to expressly teach including a plot stamp with each Sheet of the published Sheet Set.

However, Workman teaches including a plot stamp with each published Sheet (see par. 5, par. 51). **(claim 5; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager includes a plot stamp with each of the Sheets of the published Sheet Set.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set with a plot stamp as taught by Workman to provide the benefit of quickly allowing designers to review and identify the drawings within a Sheet Set (see Workman; par. 4-5, par. 51).

Claims 6, 7 and 10:

Claims 6, 7 and 10 are apparatus claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 5 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above.

Claims 11, 12, and 15:

Claims 11, 12, and 15 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 1,

2 and 5 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above.

10. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney, in view of Workman as cited above, and in further view of Haddad, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0111928 A1.

Claim 3:

Neither Bonney nor Workman expressly teaches applying publishing override properties for the Sheets.

However, Haddad teaches "Fig. 9C illustrates a graphical user interface screen for editing print settings for a selected document set etc...Parameters related to the print media are entered by the user in the sheet definitions fields 932" (see p. 7 par. 91).

(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets.) Examiner considers the print settings entered by the user for a printing work order to override any default publishing printing properties at a reprographic company that receive the printing work order for the drawing sheets. **(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager applies publishing overrides to the published Sheet Set, thereby changing a plurality of publishing properties for the Sheets.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify

the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for print settings as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of properly applying a print specification to a drawing document in an efficient manner (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure 2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 4-5).

Claim 4:

Neither Bonny nor Workman expressly teaches allowing different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.

However, Haddad teaches *"one or more repro companies can be selected to produce the print work order"* (see p. 7-8 par. 93). **(claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows different elements of the published Sheet Set to be sent to different output devices.)** Examiner considers the repro companies to be capable of printing the applicable documents or files (see Haddard; p. 4 par. 51). Therefore, the different repro companies listed in the graphical interface of Haddard's Figure 11 have their own individual output device, which allows a user to send print work orders associated with drawing sheets to the different repro companies having their own printing output device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer aided design program as taught by Bonney to include an interface for publishing a Sheet Set as taught by Workman and to modify the application program in Bonney's Figure 2 to include a graphical user interface for repro companies as taught by Haddad to provide the benefit of efficiently producing and

distributing printed documents (see Bonney; par. 23 Figure 2) (see Workman; par. 5, par. 51) (see Haddad; p. 1 par. 9-11).

Claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 are apparatus claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 3 and 4 above.

Claims 13 and 14:

Claims 13 and 14 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 3 and 4 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 13 and 14 above.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6/28/2007

HO



Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100